## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS MARSHALL DIVISION

ACTION NO.
ACTION NO.: 7-00572-JRG-RSP
ARGUMENT REQUESTED
/

## OBJECTIONS TO ARCHER & WHITE'S SUMMARY JUDGMENT EVIDENCE AND RESPONSE TO PLAINTIFF'S OBJECTION TO DANAHER EXHIBIT 49

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 56(c)(2), Defendants Danaher Corporation, Instrumentarium Dental Inc., Dental Equipment LLC, Kavo Dental Technologies, LLC, and Dental Imaging Technologies Corp. ("Defendants") object that the following materials cited in Plaintiff Archer & White's response to Defendants' motion for summary judgment cannot be presented in a form that would be admissible in evidence. These objections are made for the purpose of summary judgment only. Defendants reserve all objections to the admissibility of testimony and exhibits at trial. Danaher Corporation also responds to Plaintiff's objection to Exhibit 49 to Danaher's Motion for Summary Judgment.

Evidence	Objection		
Exhibits 1, 10, 59, 97	For the reasons set forth in Defendants' joint		
	Daubert filings, the expert report (including		
	the exhibits thereto) and testimony of Drs.		
	Magee and Ikizler should be excluded in their		
	entirety. Dkts. 298, 350. As also set forth in		
	those filings, the report contains numerous		
	embedded instances of inadmissible evidence,		
	such as multiple-layer hearsay, lack of		

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Defendants incorporate by reference objections to Archer's summary judgment evidence filed by any other Defendant.

Evidence	Objection		
	personal knowledge, undisclosed expert opinions, and undisclosed factual bases. <i>Id.</i> Defendants further object to these exhibits on the ground that expert reports and testimony cannot be used to prove up the underlying facts upon which the opinions are based. <i>Id.</i>		
Exhibits 3, 102, 105	These documents have not been authenticated. Fed. R. Evid. 901, 902.		
Exhibits 4, 11, 32, 78; Exhibit B to Archer Objections	The substance of Archer's testimony or statements is inadmissible hearsay offered for the truth of the matters asserted. Fed. R. Evid. 802.		
Exhibits 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 31, 35, 38, 71, 81, 85, 100, 106, 122, 124	The secretly recorded conversations (themselves and when played at depositions) contain inadmissible hearsay offered for the truth of the matters asserted, including double-and sometimes triple-level hearsay. Fed. R. Evid. 802; see Defendants' Omnibus Motion in Limine, Dkt. 358 (Jan. 30, 2018). They also pertain to Dynamic Dental, and therefore lack relevance to this case. Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402; see Defendants' Omnibus Motion in Limine, Dkt. 358 (Jan. 30, 2018).		
Exhibits 12, 14, 15, 16, 23, 26, 42, 43, 44, 50, 52, 70, 82, 95, 96, 104, 107, 115, 118, 127, 128, 130	Statements of other defendants offered for the truth of the matter asserted constitute inadmissible hearsay as to Danaher and the Dental Company Defendants. Fed. R. Evid. 802. To the extent they pertain to Dynamic Dental, they lack relevance to this case. Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402; see Defendants' Omnibus Motion in Limine, Dkt. 358 (Jan. 30, 2018).		
Exhibits 24, 25, 27, 28, 29, 30, 40, 41, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 109, 110, 111, 127, 128, 129	These exhibits relate to alleged conspiracies or wrongful acts that have nothing to do with Archer. As explained in Defendants' Motion in Limine #2, this evidence should be excluded. See Defendants' Omnibus Motion in Limine, Dkt. 358 (Jan. 30, 2018); Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402, 403, 404. Statements of other defendants offered for the truth of the matter asserted constitute inadmissible hearsay as to Danaher and the Dental Company Defendants. Fed. R. Evid. 802.		
Exhibit 33, 34; Exhibit A to Archer Objections	Mr. Pettus's and Mr. Salerno's depositions contain embedded hearsay and concern Dynamic Dental. Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402, 802,		

Evidence	Objection
	Defendants' Omnibus Motion in Limine, Dkt. 358 (Jan. 30, 2018).
Exhibit 47	As explained in Defendants' Motion in Limine #5, the handwritten notes of former Dynamic employee Skip Pettus are inadmissible hearsay, offered for the truth of the matters asserted, including double- and sometimes triple-level hearsay. See Defendants' Omnibus Motion in Limine, Dkt. 358 (Jan. 30, 2018); Fed. R. Evid. 802, 805. They also pertain to Dynamic Dental, and therefore lack relevance to this case. Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402; see Defendants' Omnibus Motion in Limine, Dkt. 358 (Jan. 30, 2018).
Exhibits 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 117	These exhibits relate to distributors other than the Distributor Defendants and Archer and contain hearsay. As explained in Defendants' Motion in Limine #3, this evidence should be excluded. <i>See</i> Defendants' Omnibus Motion in Limine, Dkt. 358 (Jan. 30, 2018); Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402, 403, 802.
Exhibits 79, 80, 81, 82, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 106, 116, 119, 120	These exhibits relate to non-party dental equipment manufacturers and contain multiple levels of hearsay. As explained in Defendants' Motion in Limine #4, this evidence should be excluded. <i>See</i> Defendants' Omnibus Motion in Limine, Dkt. 358 (Jan. 30, 2018); Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402, 403, 802.
Exhibit 98	This document contains embedded, inadmissible hearsay. Fed. R. Evid. 802.
Exhibit 101	Mr. Givens's testimony contains inadmissible hearsay. Fed. R. Evid. 802.
Exhibit 132	Under Fed. R. Evid. 106, the following additional portions of the deposition should be, in fairness, considered at the same time: Ex. 52 to Summ. J. Reply, Dyer Tr. 28:2–13 (testifying that he was not involved in the decision to terminate Archer & White in 2014); Dyer Tr. 66:11–18 (testifying that non-party distributor Pearson was terminated because of "the quality of service and support").

Defendants also submit the following response to Plaintiff's objection to Defendants' summary judgment evidence.

Evidence	Objection	Response
Exhibit 49 to Danaher's Motion for Summary Judgment, Dkt. No. 299-50	The substance of this email and attachments is inadmissible hearsay offered for the truth of the matter asserted. <i>See</i> Fed. R. Evid. 802.	The document is admissible as a business record under Fed. R. Evid. 803(6). In

Dated: February 9, 2018

Respectfully submitted,

## /s/ Brett C. Govett

Brett C. Govett (Bar No. 08235900) Katherine Lett (Bar No. 24007548) NORTON ROSE FULBRIGHT US LLP 2200 Ross Avenue, Suite 3600 Dallas, TX 75201

Tel: (214) 855-8118 Fax: (214) 855-8200

 $Brett.Govett@nortonrosefulbright.com\\Katherine.Lett@nortonrosefulbright.com$ 

Layne E. Kruse (Bar No. 11742550) NORTON ROSE FULBRIGHT US LLP 1301 McKinney, Suite 5100 Houston, TX 77010

Tel: (713) 651-5151 Fax: (713) 651-5246

Layne.Kruse@nortonrosefulbright.com

Jonathan B. Pitt (pro hac vice) Liam J. Montgomery (pro hac vice) Matthew C. Monahan (pro hac vice) WILLIAMS & CONNOLLY LLP 725 Twelfth Street, N.W. Washington, DC 20005

Tel: (202) 434-5000 Fax: (202) 434-5029

jpitt@wc.com

lmontgomery@wc.com mmonahan@wc.com

Counsel for Defendants Danaher Corporation, Instrumentarium Dental Inc., Dental Equipment LLC, Kavo Dental Technologies, LLC, and Dental Imaging Technologies Corp.

## **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that a copy of the above and foregoing has been served upon all counsel of record by using the Court's electronic filing system on February 9, 2018.

/s/ Brett C. Govett
Brett C. Govett